



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Now we ask our "inquirer" to consider, in which Testament does he expect to find "the articles of the Christian faith," in the Old or in the New? Who was it that revealed and declared to the world the doctrines of the Gospel, and the articles of the Christian faith? Was it not Christ and his apostles? Well, then, in the words of Christ and his apostles, and in their writings, we expect to find the articles of the Christian faith, and not in the Old Testament writings, which were finished 300 years before Christ came.

We do not undervalue the Old Testament. There are many things to be learned by us besides "articles of faith." In the Old Testament we learn much of the character and the dealings of God, and we learn there, too, the corruption of human nature. In the Old Testament, too (when rightly explained by the New), we find many glorious prophecies concerning the Gospel, and the doctrines of the Gospel, which serve to throw great light on the New Testament. The Old Testament was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ: in the New, Christ and his doctrines are revealed to us. This we are bold to affirm (and we expect no Roman Catholic will contradict it)—that there is no article of Gospel faith prophesied of in the *Old* Testament which is not declared and revealed in the *New* Testament. Take any book you please of the Old Testament—Joshua, for instance, or Judges, or the Proverbs, or even the evangelical prophet Isaiah—and tell us **WHAT** article of the Christian faith we would now be without, if that book had been lost? And if this be so, with the whole of the Old Testament that *we have*, what show of reason can there be for supposing that we have lost any article of the Christian faith by the loss of any other books of the Old Testament, if any have really been lost?

Our correspondent's letter suggests to us another argument on this subject.

He says:—"Our Lord, in expounding to his apostles **ALL** the prophets, must have included those prophetic writings not now extant." Well, if he did, we trust we still have, in what those apostles taught, any articles of Christian faith contained in those books, although the books themselves be lost. If those books did contain such things, and if those books be now lost, all that either the Church of Rome or we can now do is, to seek for what the apostles taught. What they wrote in Scripture we *know* is their teaching. If any one can show us that anything *else* taught by the apostles has been handed down to us by the Catholic Church from the times of the apostles themselves, so that we may be sure that it really came from them, let them show us this too, and we have already expressed our readiness to believe it. Does not our "Inquirer" now see that this is the only thing that *ought* to convince us that we are *wrong*—namely, to point out to us *other* articles of faith, and to show us that these have really been handed down from the apostles themselves? Yet this is the very thing that we do *not* find in his letter. Nothing will direct his own inquiries better than trying to convince us of our errors. Let him try and tell us, then, what articles of Christian faith, besides those contained in Scripture, we ought to believe. Let him show us *what these articles are*, and what the proof is that the apostles taught them.

To return to the lost books. What *proof* is there that the lost books in question were really inspired by the Holy Spirit? *None* of the places that mention these books say that they were inspired. We know that the apostles themselves, in their inspired writings, quote books that were not inspired. But it will be said, some of these books were written by "prophets." We grant that: but were prophets *always* inspired? We have good ground for believing that they were not: that they *sometimes* spoke as the Holy Ghost moved them, and at other times spoke as other men do. We believe this is agreed on all hands. Is there any better reason to believe that they always were inspired as soon as they took a pen in their hands? We see no reason to believe this. "A prophet" might write a letter, just as other men wrote one, and that letter was not inspired. "A prophet"—i.e., one who was sometimes inspired—might write a book of history, and that book might not be inspired. There was certainly, at that time, a way of knowing what speeches or what writings of a prophet were inspired. The prophets knew the difference themselves. And the difference could be proved to other men, while the power of working miracles existed, and while the High Priest could inquire of God in the tabernacle.

The question is, did the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, count these books inspired? We reply that there is *no evidence* that the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, ever counted any books inspired besides those which we now have of the Old Testament. We invite inquiry about this.

But when were these books lost? This may throw some light on the question.

We think our correspondent has succeeded in proving that no prophetic books were lost *before* our Saviour's time. He says—"Our Lord, in expounding to his Apostles **all** the prophets (see Luke xxiv., verse 27), must have included those prophetic writings not now extant." We think this conclusive proof that none had been lost before that time. The question is, have any books then existing been lost since? Now

this is clearly not the case. Josephus, a very learned Jew, who was born before our Saviour died, tells us what sacred books the Jews then had: he says they had only twenty-two which were counted inspired; they had other books, he says, which were not of the like authority. Now, taking the twelve lesser prophets as "one book" (which we know that the Jews did), this exactly agrees with the books we now have. It is impossible to bring into that number all the books our correspondent reckons up. Either, then, these books were not counted inspired in our Saviour's time, or they were lost before his time. In either case we have the inspired books of the Jews, just as they stood in our Saviour's time. If he found no fault with those books, as they then stood—if he did not blame the Jews for not having all the inspired books they should have had (and we know that he did not)—if he was content to take those books as they then stood, without asking for more or less, surely we may do so also. What better authority can we have than his in such a question?

We are, therefore, satisfied to take the books of the Old Testament as our Saviour took them, and the books of the New Testament as the tradition of all Christians has handed them down to us; and as far as this argument goes, we see no shadow of reason for believing them to be insufficient.

Nor do we see any reason, so far, for going to tradition for more articles of faith, until some one can show any such articles, with proof that the apostles preached them.

We now call to our correspondent's recollection a passage of his own letter—"Hence, we say, give us **all** the sacred prophetic writings ever written, and we will abide by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

Now, if we have shown him that we have all the sacred writings of the Old Testament as our Saviour had them, and was content to take them; and, further, that we have all the sacred writings of the New Testament, that ever were heard of by the Church on earth, is not this enough?

And even if it were not, if any books had been lost out of the Old Testament, yet since at least we have all in which we could have any expectation of finding "articles of Christian faith," is not this all that we can require?

We trust, then, that our correspondent will now perform what he promised, and abide "by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

We could not deal lightly with this argument about the lost books of Scripture. It has taken up so much room, we must leave the remainder of this letter for the next month.

"W. C. SEARCH" AND BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

"Warner Christian Search" has to explain, that he took the passage referred to in Bishop Taylor's work of *Liberty of Prophecy*, not from any edition of the original, but from a controversial treatise on *Purgatory*, by a Roman Catholic writer.

"W. C. S." begs further to add, that he has since consulted Doctor Taylor's work itself, and finds the quotation to appear, with the words ("SAYS THE ROMANIST") in a parenthesis. There is no writer, among Church of England theologians, whose works are so erroneously appealed to, and whose views on certain doctrines are so misrepresented as Bishop Taylor.

"W. C. SEARCH."

Sept. 24, 1852.

P.S.—You forget to observe upon some of the early Fathers—St. Chrysostom, for instance—declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of *APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*.

We suspected that "W. C. Search" took his quotation at second hand from some Roman controversial writer who had given the passage without these words; and we find by his letter that he did so, though he does not give us the name of the writer who deceived him, as we think he was bound, in fairness, to have done, when we invited him to clear himself, by telling us the name of the book, so that others might be put on their guard against it. We regret that he has not done so; and, once more, we call on him, as he regards his own character for honesty and truth, to tell us from what book he took his quotation from Bishop Taylor, otherwise, though we are quite willing to believe that it was not "W. C. S." himself that committed the fraud in the quotation about the Maccabees, we cannot exculpate him from the charge of screening from exposure the writer who did so.

We have not forgotten our promise of commenting on "W. C. Search's" passages from the Fathers of the fourth century, which he has cited as in favour of *Purgatory*; and we have already in type an article upon the subject, which press of matter precludes us from inserting in our present number.

KINGSTOWN HARBOUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Please your honour, I read the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* regular, for the master lends it to me; and since

you are so kind in printing letters, maybe you would take one from a poor man like me.

The master sent me to Dublin last week, with cattle that was going to Liverpool, for the herd was ill. And because I never was in Dublin, he told me to take a day to look about me, and he wouldn't stop the wages. So, sure enough, I went down to Kingstown by the railway, and, my! what a place it is! All them ships, and the steam vessels, all fizzing and buzzing, and seeming in such a hurry to be off, and the big stones, and the bright bonnets, and the purty faces, and all the cars, and the fine houses, and what isn't there? And them big walls running straight out into the sea, and, my! the stones in them walls! and every wall ten times as wide as the street before my door! And if I didn't see a big iron chest let down into the sea, and two men in it, going down to their work at the bottom of the sea as pleasant as I'd go to dig pratics; and may I be happy if there was a bottom to the chest!

And while I was walking about looking at it all, I met a mighty pleasant looking gentleman, and I made bold to speak to him; and "please your honour," says I, "how long were they making all this place?" And so he answered me quite pleasant, and says he, "I believe they're fifty years making it anyway." "Fifty years!" says I, "and isn't it done yet?" "No, indeed," says he, "and I don't see much signs of its being done." "And when will it be done, your honour?" says I. And with that he stopt short in his walk, and seemed to be considering for a bit, and says he, "The parliament allows ten thousand pounds a year," says he, "for finishing it, and it is my opinion, that it never will be finished till that is stopt," "Well, tear and ages," says I, "maybe that's just the way with my father's soul," says I; for the thought just came across me all in a minute. "What do you mean?" says he. "Why," says I, "I'm paying ten shillings a year, for these six years past," says I, "to Father D—, for getting my father's soul out of purgatory," says I; "and maybe it's just the same way, that he'll never get out till that's stopt," says I. And with that he considered again a bit, and says he, "Did Father D— never say to you, I needn't take any more money from you, for your father's soul's out?" "No, 'deed, didn't he, your honour," says I. "And did you never hear," says he, "of Father D— saying that to any one else?" "I never heard of the like of that, your honour," says I. "Well," says he, "maybe you're right enough, and maybe your father's soul is like enough to Kingstown harbour," says he; "maybe, while you go on paying for the job it won't suit them to finish the job; and maybe when you stop paying, there won't be anything to finish the job with; and maybe it won't be worth their while to finish the job at their own cost," says he.

So, your honour, I don't know what to do at all, or whether to go on paying, or to stop; and I thought I would just write to your honour, that seems so knowledgeable, and ask if you ever heard of a priest saying to a poor man that came with money for masses, "I needn't take that, my man, for your father's soul's out before this." So waiting your honour's answer, I remain your humble servant to command,

PAT MURRAY, of Westmeath.

If any of our correspondents can report such a case as Pat Murray wishes for, we shall be happy to publish it, as we do not happen to know of such a case ourselves. Our correspondent need hardly have gone to Kingstown to see a chest without a bottom, where the lower places are concerned. We suspect there is no bottom to Father D—'s chest; and we are pretty sure there is no bottom to p——y itself.—ED.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR OCTOBER.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette*.)

The Dun or Winter Oats, Black Barley, Bere, and Rye should be sown as early in the month as possible; if not already got in, advantage should be taken of dry weather, and while the land is dry to get in these crops, particularly the Dun oat. By so doing a considerable saving of seed will be effected, as if farther advanced in the season, and the land wet, considerably more seed will be required (see operations for last month).

Winter Vetches, either alone or mixed with oats or rye, should be sown immediately, where not sown last month, so as to insure a strong braid before the frosts set in.

Russian or Winter Beans should, if possible, be got in before the middle of the month. This hardy and productive variety is fast superseding most other kinds to a great extent.

Parsnips, if sown this month, on tolerably dry, but well-tilled and well-manured land, come in early, and produce heavy crops.

Rape sown in the summer months may be still transplanted in the stubble land, as directed last month.

Early Cabbages sown in July last should now be transplanted in well, cultivated and well-manured land, if wanted early.